

A22  
9



## SITE PLAN APPLICATION – MASTER COMMENT REPORT

CASE NUMBER: SPC-06-0716C.SH  
REVISION #: 0 UPDATE: U3  
CASE MANAGER: Javier Delgado PHONE #: 974-7648

PROJECT NAME: 300 E. RIVERSIDE(WITHDRAWAL AND RESUBMITTAL OF SP-06-0347C.SH)  
LOCATION: 300 E RIVERSIDE DR

SUBMITTAL DATE: August 16, 2007  
REPORT DUE DATE: August 30, 2007  
FINAL REPORT DATE: September 4, 2007  
5 DAYS HAVE BEEN ADDED TO THE UPDATE DEADLINE

### STAFF REPORT:

This report includes all staff comments received to date concerning your most recent site plan submittal. The comments may include requirements, recommendations, or information. The requirements in this report must be addressed by an updated site plan submittal.

The site plan will be approved when all requirements from each review discipline have been addressed. However, until this happens, your site plan is considered disapproved. Additional comments may be generated as a result of information or design changes provided in your update.

If you have any questions, problems, concerns, or if you require additional information about this report, please do not hesitate to contact your case manager at the phone number listed above or by writing to the City of Austin, Watershed Protection and Development Review Department, P.O. Box 1088, Austin, Texas 78704.

### UPDATE DEADLINE (LDC 25-5-113):

It is the responsibility of the applicant or his/her agent to update this site plan application. **The final update to clear all comments must be submitted by the update deadline, which is December 10, 2007.** Otherwise, the application will automatically be denied. If this date falls on a weekend or City of Austin holiday, the next City of Austin workday will be the deadline.

### EXTENSION OF UPDATE DEADLINE (LDC 25-1-88):

You may request an extension to the update deadline by submitting a written justification to your case manager on or before the update deadline. Extensions may be granted for good cause at the Director's discretion.

### UPDATE SUBMITTALS:

**A formal update submittal is required. You must make an appointment with the Intake Staff (974-2689) to submit the update. Please bring a copy of this report with you upon submittal to Intake.**

**Please submit 6 copies of the plans and 7 copies of a letter** that address each comment for distribution to the following reviewers. Clearly label information or packets with the reviewer's name that are intended for specific reviewers. No distribution is required for the Planner 1 and only the letter is required for Austin Water Utility.

### REVIEWERS:

Electric : David Lambert  
Environmental : Javier Delgado  
Fire For Site Plan : Cora Urgena  
Planner 1 : Yolanda Parada  
Site Plan : Javier Delgado  
R.O.W. : Mark Boitnott  
Transportation : Joe Almazan  
Water Quality : Jennifer Groody

EXHIBIT "B"

A22  
10

## Drainage Construction Review - Jennifer Groody, P.E. - 974-6361

- DC 2. According to the new FEMA study, the 440.5 contour line is the bench mark for the limit of the flood plain, please see sheet 13 of 23 site plan. I have noticed on sheet 13 that the dedication of the drainage easement is below the flood plain contour line. According to the LDC the drainage easement must be contain the 100-year flood plain, therefore the applicant should draw the drainage easement above or equal the floodplain contour line.

### UPDATE 2 & 3

Awaiting drainage easement documents.

## Fire For Site Plan Review - Cora Urgena - 974-0184

- FR 4. ~~Provide AFD with information on the type of fire rated separation provided between the garage and the residential and between the Type III-A residential portion and Type I-A residential portion.~~  
Update #2 - Since only 1-hour fire separations are provided between the different types of construction, AFD will need to verify if the required fire flow for the worst case portion of the building can be used instead of the required fire flow for the entire building.  
Update #3. Contact reviewer to schedule a meeting to discuss this item.

- FR 5. ~~Request a flow test from AFD.~~  
~~Update #2 - The flow test was not included with the update.~~  
Update #3 - Email flow test to reviewer.

- FR 10. Provide hydraulic fire flow calculations for the needed fire flow to the buildings. Include in these calculations the friction loss through fire lines to ensure adequate flow to hydrants. All hydrants and nodes that are included in the calculations need to be identified for verification by this office Include in the calculations any backflow preventers installed in lines. Verify that the maximum velocity of 10 ft/s is not exceeded in the fire line. The calculations must be sealed by a Texas P.E.

NOT APPROVED - UPDATE 3 - 8/27/2007

## Water Quality Review - Jennifer Groody, P.E. - 974-6361

- WQ 4. ECM 1.6.5 (B)(2) states, "The outlet structure should be a berm or wall with multiple outlet ports or a gabion so as to discharge the flow evenly to the filtration basin. Rock gabions should be constructed using five (5) to eight (8)

inch diameter rocks. The berm/wall/gabion height should not exceed six (6) feet and high flows should be allowed to overtop the structure (weir flow). Multiple outlet ports should be used in the berm/wall so as to induce flow-spreading." The Gabion Wall should start below the sand bed a minimum six inches or deeper depending on the total height of the wall. A solid wall with risers is not allowed for partial sedimentation/filtration systems. Please replace the wall with a gabion wall.

**UPDATE 2**

The solid wall with risers was replaced with a gabion wall. The gabion wall should be 0.5' below the WQ elevation, not the elevation of the splitter weir as provided. Please comply.

**UPDATE 3**

Gabion elevation revised. Comment cleared.

- WQ 5. Please provide a gabion wall detail that matches the requirements of ECM 1.6.5(B)(2). The detail should indicate that the Gabion Wall shall be constructed in accordance with City of Austin Standard Specification 594S.

**UPDATE 2**

The specifications provided for the gabion wall refers to stone size being 3-5" in diameter. Per ECM 1.6.5(B)(2), the gabion wall should be constructed of five (5) to eight (8) inch diameter rocks. Please revise.

**UPDATE 3**

Specification revised. Comment cleared.

- WQ 11. Structural details are required for splitter box.

**UPDATE 3**

Awaiting structural details.

- WQ 12. Please explain how the pond will be maintained during a storm event that forces the flap gates on the outfall closed.

**UPDATE 3**

Town Lake was at an elevated level for a significant period of time during the recent storm events in the Highland Lakes area. Provide water quality during periods of elevated lake levels.

- WQ 13. Access for both maintenance and inspection of the water quality facility must be provided. When designing access for the facilities, please consider OSHA confined space entry standards and the safety of those who would be entering. The water quality pond must be accessible from the sedimentation & filtration basins as well as the splitter box. Please comply.

**UPDATE 3**

Provide accessibility for the sedimentation basin and splitter box.

Parks Review - Javier Delgado- 974-7648

No comment.

Electric Review - David Lambert - 322-6109

- EL 1. Show the location of the existing electric facilities on this site on the demolition plan and proposed site plan.

Update 2: Some of the electric facilities have been shown on the water and wastewater plans. Thank you.

Show all of the existing electric facilities, including overhead lines, on the demolition and site plan.

The conflicts can't be identified until this is done. It's basic information.

Update 3: It's understood this information will be added to the plans.

- EL 2. Show the location of the transformer pads and the assignment for the underground electric cabling needed to power this site on the site plan, and water and wastewater plan and, if there is any offsite electric work, include in the limits of construction. We aren't asking you to design the facilities, we're just trying to be sure we have adequate locations and space for our facilities. Contact Marvin Johnson at 505-7639 or contact me to set up a meeting to discuss. A meeting can be very beneficial in getting this issue moving forward.

Update 2: Two transformer pads are shown but will they be enough and where will the power cable be routed?

Contact me ASAP to schedule a meeting with Austin Energy's review team to discuss the location of Austin Energy's facilities. The owner's MEP should also attend.

Update 3: To date, there has been no request by the owner's representatives for a meeting to discuss the electric service issues. However, it is understood the final design of the project is yet to be determined.

- EL 3. Show the volume and page of the electric and tele. easements.

Update 2: Vol. and page is shown on the water and wastewater plan. They should also be shown on the site plan.

- EL 4. Will any of the existing electric and telephone easements need to be vacated prior to construction?

A2:  
13

Update 2: Has the vacation of the portions of electric and telephone easements been applied for?

Update 3: This issue depends on the outcome of the final design.

EL 5 – EL 7. Informational comments only.

EL 8. NEW COMMENT FOR UPDATE 2:

I shall prepare a blanket electric easement, including the 222 E. Riverside project, so that we may place electric facilities on this site, and in particular, extend them to 222 E. Riverside.

Update 3: I can't provide electric service to 222 E Riverside using a blanket easement, as the ownership is different. Sorry, I assumed they were under common ownership.

This issue should be discussed at the meeting which is needed to discuss electric service to these sites.

## Environmental Review - Javier Delgado - 974-7648

EV 01. Is the parkland area to be dedicated fee simple to PARD?

EV 02. **CLEARED.**

EV 03. **CLEARED.**

EV 04. Submit an ESC fiscal estimate. **Approved.**

EV 05. Pay landscape fee of \$500. Provide review with copy of receipt.

EV 06. Show CWQZ along Town Lake. **On site plan sheet as well.**

## R.O.W. Review - Jason T. Redfern - 974-7180

RW 1. Rejected. Awaiting updated plan submittal\*\*\*jtr

## Site Plan Review - Javier Delgado - 974-7648

SP 02. Show the dimensions of all existing and proposed structures.

SP 04. Provide elevation cross-sections of proposed development in relation to SF property. **Yes.**

SP 06. **CLEARED.**

SP 07. **CLEARED.**

SP 08. The impervious cover limit in the primary setback is 30% in the secondary setback. A waiver from this requirement must be approved by the Planning Commission. [Sec. 25-2-731 to 746]. **Comment will be cleared if waiver is granted.**

SP 09. Plan shows proposed uses that are not allowed in the primary (any improvement not on public park land) and secondary setbacks. A waiver from this requirement must be approved by the Planning Commission. **Comment will be cleared if waiver is granted.**

SP 11. Basewall is required. Show the basewall elevation and the height of the basewall facing Town Lake and Riverside Dr. [Section 25-2-721(E)]. **Give more detail concerning the material to be used for the base wall.**

SP 14. **CLEARED.**

SP 12. Provide approval signatures on mylar cover sheet and utility sheets by Water and Wastewater Dept. and Fire Dept. For Plumbing code requirements, utility line and meter sizes, contact Monty Lowell, 974-2882, Plumbing Plan Review.

SP 13. Plumbing and fire lines installed after June 2, 1997, may not cross lot lines without approval by Water and Wastewater Dept. and Fire Department.

SP 14. Approval by Water and Wastewater Dept. and Fire Dept. is needed for release of utility easements.

Transportation Review - Joe Almazan - 974-2674
--

TR 1. For information only.

TR 2. Addressed.

TR 3. Addressed.

TR 4. Addressed.

TR 5. Addressed.

TR 6. Addressed.

TR 7. Addressed.

TR 8. Addressed.

- TR 9. Passenger loading zones must provide an access aisle at least 5 ft. wide and 20 ft. long adjacent and parallel to the vehicle pull-up space. [ANSI 503.2 – 503.4, Fig. 503.3]. *This comment has not been addressed with this site plan update.*
- TR10. Addressed.
- TR11. Addressed.
- TR12. Addressed.
- TR13. Addressed.
- TR14. Addressed.
- TR15. Addressed.
- TR16. Addressed.
- TR17. Stopping sight distance is needed at all driveway approaches. Submit driveway profiles and calculations to verify sight distance. TCM, 1.3.1.C.6. *According to the engineer's response letter, the view to the east of the proposed driveway is restricted by tree and vegetation, but there is **300** feet of available sight distance. The speed limit for Riverside Drive, between Lamar Blvd. and Parker Lane is 35 mph. According to Table 1-1 [Minimum Sight Distance], the absolute minimum sight distance from driveways entering or crossing a 4 or 5 lane street is **410** for a 35 mph design speed. It is recommended that the applicant meet with the transportation reviewer and engineer reviewer to discuss further.*
- TR18. Driveways on undivided arterial streets must be designed to align with opposing streets or driveways or be offset by a minimum of 120 feet, measured from edge to edge. TCM, 5.3.1.K. **At this time, a waiver will not be granted to allow a driveway offset of approximately 12 feet from the opposing existing driveway along Riverside Drive. It is recommended that the applicant meet with the transportation reviewer to discuss alternatives for relocating the proposed driveway.**
- TR19. Driveway approaches must be separated by a minimum of 200 feet, measured from edge to edge at the property line. TCM, Table 5-2. **At this time, a waiver will not be granted to allow a driveway spacing of approximately 30.6 feet from the adjacent existing driveway along Riverside Drive. It is recommended that the applicant meet with the transportation reviewer to discuss alternatives for relocating the proposed driveway, including consideration for joint use driveway access from the adjacent property owner.**
- TR20. Addressed.